

RECEIVED
JAN 30 2003

Message 20 of 20

From: <k5zol@earthlink.net>
To: ak437@acorn.net
Date: Thu, 02 Jan 2003 12:48:17 -0800
Subject: Re: UR FCC petition

I went to their website. Is making comments easier than it looks? Looked like I'd have to spend some time learning their system and getting things in the format they accept?

I would like to comment, but have never done that before.

K5ZOL

On Thu, 2 Jan 2003 15:39:17 US/Eastern ak437@acorn.net wrote:

> Thanks
>
> Please have your comments filed on line at the
> FCC ECFS page.
>
> Any additional input would be help!
>
> If you have any other changes you feel should
> be blended into
> this please make your point line by line so
> they have public
> input.
>
> Thanks Again
>
> Dale Reich - k8ad
>
> > I think your upgrade petition makes a lot of
> sense. goodluck.
> > 73,
> >
> > Bob K5ZOL
> >

> -----
> This message was sent using ACORN.net, a
> service of the
> Akron-Summit County Public Library.
> <http://www.acorn.net>
>
>
>



Message 6 of 37

From: Harold B Wade <halbwade@juno.com>
 To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
 Date: Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:40:03 -0500
 Subject: Amateur licensing

Received: from m5.nyc.untld.com (m5.nyc.untld.com [64.136.22.68])
 by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with SMTP id gBSEd0s29313
 for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:39:01 -0500 (EST)
 Received: from cookie.juno.com by cookie.juno.com for <"laj/63Gb00f13I0IA9nvzo9LzmTjaBCS1c069MbRHQOFNaD
 Received: (from halbwade@juno.com)
 by m5.nyc.untld.com (jqueuemail) id HL5GCV3E; Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:38:56 EST
 To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
 Date: Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:40:03 -0500
 Subject: Amateur licensing
 Message-ID: <20021228.094005.-4148557.2.halbwade@juno.com>
 X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.15
 MIME-Version: 1.0
 Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=--_JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be
 X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 8-6,7-8,11-12,22-23,28-29,32-33,36-37,41-46,47-32767
 From: Harold B Wade <halbwade@juno.com>
 X-UIDL: /U\!!^hvd9CPN!\#*!!
 Status: RO

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----_JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be
 Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Dale

I saw a reference to you and your recommendation on license upgrades for advanced class in yesterdays ARRL bulletin, and have a comment to make on that.

Over fifty years ago, 1949, I was licensed as class "A", which required code proficiency at twenty words per minute, and a stiff written exam. At the same time I held a FCC commercial license for radio telegraphy, also requiring twenty words per minute. I also held FCC commercial license for radiotelephone operation. All these licenses required testing for knowledge far in excess of any of our current amateur licenses. We had to draw complete schematic diagrams for power supplies, oscillators, amplifiers etc. we had to trouble shoot equipment from diagrams supplied by the FCC. We had to receive AND send code in the presence of an FCC examiner to his satisfaction.

I was a graduate of the USAF Radio Operator school (32 weeks) which required code proficiency of twenty five words per minute for a minimum passing grade. I was also a graduate of the USAF Radio Mechanic school (36 weeks) requiring extensive knowledge of electronics hardware and circuitry.

What I am leading up to here, is that I was more than a little miffed when the FCC changed my license class to Advanced and I learned I would have to do more testing to recover my lost operating privileges.

I suppose it amounts to an attitude problem on my account, but so far I have declined to submit to any further testing in the interest of operating privileges.

Another federal agency, The FAA, recognizes military training, experience and proficiency. I am licensed as a commercial pilot by the FAA, but I have never ridden with an FAA examiner. The FAA issued the license based on my USAF rating as a pilot.

Thanks and good luck in your endeavors.

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<http://www2.acorn.net/mailman3/mmstdol.cgi?SOURCE:6H%3c20021228%2e094005%2e...> 1/4/2003

<DIV> </DIV></BODY></HTML>

----__JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be--

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopædia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude



**Message 14 of 22**

From: "AL MAC KENZIE" <WB6BBH@arri.net>
To: <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>
Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 14:39:47 -0800
Subject: RM-10620

Received: from mail.netzon.net (netzon-gw.netzon.net [65.200.2.65])
 by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with SMTP id gBVMdgs11540
 for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Tue, 31 Dec 2002 17:39:43 -0500 (EST)
 Received: (qmail 23075 invoked from network); 31 Dec 2002 22:39:35 -0000
 Received: from 208-187-134-131.lax.ca.ppp-inter.net (HELO np0qadckaosc1n) (208.187.
 by hb1.netzon.net with SMTP; 31 Dec 2002 22:39:35 -0000
 Message-ID: <000801c2b11d\$876c60f0\$8386bbd0@np0qadckaosc1n>
 From: "AL MAC KENZIE" <WB6BBH@arri.net>
 To: <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>
 Subject: RM-10620
 Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 14:39:47 -0800
 MIME-Version: 1.0
 Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0005_01C2B0DA.77B73650"
 X-Priority: 3
 X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
 X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2720.3000
 X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
 X-UIDL: -Lc!!BIN!!U7j!!Aj~!!
 Status: RO

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0005_01C2B0DA.77B73650
 Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
 Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

KUDOS TO YOU DALE TO GET AN RM FROM THE FCC I HAVE TRIED TO MAKE =
 COMMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL BUT IT WONT WORK FOR ME. ONCE AGAIN =
 THE FCC MAKES THIER E MAIL FORM TO COMPLICATED. I SUPPLIED ALL THEY =
 WANTED & GET THE ANSWER THAT MY NAME ADDRESS & ZIP CODE ARE IN ERROR. I =
 CERTAINLY DID TRY. I HAVE READ THE ARRL BULLETIN ON SEVERAL HF NETS & DO =
 HOPE THOSE THAT MAKE THIER COMMENTS ARE SUCCESFULL.

HAPPY NEW YEAR

73 88
 AL ALICE
 ARRL BULLETIN MANAGER-ORANGE SECTION
www.qsl.net/arri-orange/
www.3952khz.net
 WB6BBH@arri.net

-----=_NextPart_000_0005_01C2B0DA.77B73650
 Content-Type: text/html;

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

-----= NextPart 000 0005 01C2B0DA.77B73650--



READY

David A. Orienti
W4BHM

1722-B Valpar Drive
Birmingham, AL. 35226
(205) 822-2114 (H) (205) 529-9820 (C)
Email - orienti@bellsouth.net
w4bhm@bellsouth.net

PAGE I-1

CODE SPEED

January 3, 2003

F.C.C.
Washington, DC

Re: Response to petition for rule making # RM-10620 from K8AD

I would like to add my opinion to the above-mentioned petition. I support this petition for the following reasons:

When I upgraded from General Class to Advanced Class back in the 70's as W8LTE, the only difference between the Advanced test and the Extra test was the 20wpm code test. Therefore, I passed the same written exam as I would have been given for upgrade to Extra Class. With the changes in code speed currently in effect, I have, in fact, passed the Extra Class license test but am only licensed as an Advanced Class operator.

Since the Advanced Class is no longer available and since I already have passed the Extra Class written test in effect at the time of my testing, I feel that I should be "upgraded" to Extra Class status.

Sincerely,

David Orienti
W4BHM
1722-B Valpar Drive
Birmingham, AL. 35226-2344

OLD { ADVANCED CLASS - 13 WPM
EXTRA 20 WPM

CURRENT { GENERAL - CLASS - 5 WPM
EXTRA - 5 WPM



RECEIVED
JAN 30 2003
Federal Communications Commission

Message 12 of 20

From: wa4ixn@juno.com
To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 05:13:12 -0600
Subject: Upgrades

Hi Dale,

Your proposal is good. Most hams don't realize that the exams have become easier through the years. The purpose being to swell the ranks with new hams without making it too difficult for them. In the "good-old-days" the exams were more technically oriented to the kind of equipment one would expect to be operating. A lot of which would be built from scratch or converted from military equipment. Rules and regulations weren't such a large portion of the exams. Neither was a lot of algebraic calculation that had little or no use in the 'real world' of ham radio. It seems now that the 'wizards' who sit and dream up the question pools are looking for electronic engineer types instead of ordinary people who just want to enjoy the hobby and talk to others of the same ilk down the street or around the world. I've been saying -- too loudly sometimes -- that if you want to play the moon bounce, ham TV, microwave, satellite games, etc., then fine. Study up on the required technology and go for it. But don't take chunks of the ordinary bands away from those of us who studied hard for the exams of 30, 40, 50 years ago, with the bent toward punched steel, hand wired, tube filled chassis, and earned the privilege and used the whole band to good purpose, just to glorify your urge to expand your knowledge. I don't know if you were around back in the 1960's when, with the full support of the ARRL, the 'blue-bloods' of ham radio crammed their desire for "incentive licensing" down the throat of the FCC and took big chunks of the bands away from the majority of hams who were, for the most part, much more active in actually using those frequencies than they were. It took a lot of hard-nosed politicking and a lot of money in the right places, but they got it done over the cries of despair from the 'average' hams and even from such notables as Barry Goldwater who was very active in the efforts to stop the breaking up of the bands. A good 'for instance' would be: You've been a licensed driver for 20 or 30 years and have exercised the privileges of your license by driving any road you want, from one end to the other, including the superhighways and interstates, in your good old Ford or Chevy. Suddenly, a bunch of wealthy executives of the black tie and tails group with their Mercedes and Jaguars decide to change things more in their favor. If you can't, or don't want to, come up to their standard, then they are going to pressure the highway department into kicking you off the roads you have driven ever since you got your license. From now on you can only drive on the back roads and be crowded into grid block traffic while the high-and-mighty who meet the new standard they set for themselves get the full use of all the roads, including the almost vacant portions they've set aside for their exclusive use.

I studied hard. I build radios from scratch and scrap. I learned all I could about communications. I took and passed on the first go-around both the Novice and the General exams. Since then, over the past fifty (50) years, I've probably built more radio equipment from junk-box parts and from kits than any dozen of those so-called "super ham" Advanced and

Extra class types. About the only things Heathkit made between 1955 (when I first could afford to buy them) and when they closed their doors in the mid '70s that I didn't build right out of the box was their television sets and stereo music boxes. The same for Knight kits and several Eico transceivers. Even now, at age 66, I still get the honor of handling the high-speed Morse on field day. Out of 69 club members there are only 3 of us who can handle more than 10 wpm. And I still use, almost exclusively, Morse in my daily operation. I don't use a keyer or a keyboard. I still use a 20-year-old Vibroplex (have worn out 3 of them), or when mobile an old WW-II leg-clamp J-38. I normally cruise along at 35-40 wpm, except with the J-38, and slow down only to work and help a Novice or Tech-plus learn code. I do have a microphone (D-104) on my desk, but it has a plastic cover on it and hasn't been used more than once in the last couple of years.

Yes, I am considering moving up to Extra Class, I've looked at the books and the question pool. To tell the truth, I have no use at all for satellites, TV, microwave, etc., and I find the high mathematics required just to regain the lost spectrum that I worked hard for 50 years ago, and feel I didn't deserve to have taken away from me, to be just so much useless garbage. I may be forced to learn all that algebraic gibberish to get my frequencies back, but I'll never use it and will toss the books in the trash the moment the exam is passed.

That brings me to the point of this letter. Why did you only specify advancing Novice and Advanced Class licensees?? There are thousands of General Class bums like me out here who are still burning at the stake over having our hard earned frequencies yanked away from us 35 years ago for the sake of a handful of nerds who only wanted the apportionment for their private use and who spend most of their time playing in the GHz bands anyway. We would love to be able to work the low ends and middle of the 80, 40, 20, and 15 meter bands again. To be able to spread out a bit so it would be so crowded all the time with everybody jammed in to small segments of the bands. Why not allow for General Class hams with 20 or more years of experience and clean records to get 'merit advancement' up to Extra Class too. I think that my 50 + years as a General (the highest class there was when I took the exam) and being highly active, especially in ARES, RACES, and Skywarn, with no violations or warnings and not even a OO note on my record, should count for something worthwhile rather than a 'look-down-the-nose from the hoity-toities of the modern super-hams, many of whom act as if they are the only ones deserving any operating privileges at all.

I think I'll get down off my soapbox now. This subject is one that I have been extremely angry and outspoken on for many years, and likely will continue to be so. I apologize if you feel I've overstepped the bounds of propriety here, but I'm not one to beat around the bush when it comes to something I think is important and will help improve the operating quality and morale of the majority of affected Amateur Radio operators.

Believe me. I have no quarrel with you as an Extra Class. I know you worked hard for it and deserve all the extra privileges it provides. I just think there are many of us out here who deserve more than the short shrift we got at the hands of a few holier-than-thou's who took command of the bands 35 years ago, with the able assistance of the ARRL pushing the buttons at the FCC. There's just not too many of us left now who have the strength left to fight anymore. When the last of us is SK it will all be over.

73 & Happy New Year
O. B. Wolf - WA4IXN
ex: 5A1TS, TA4RZ, DL4NH

WA4IXN/XV Air Mobile
WA4IXN/HZ Air Mobile

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopaedia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude



I support automatic upgrade of novice amateur license holders with as few as 5 years in class, even if their license has lapsed. I support their use of both 2 and .7 meter bands for normal usage, as well as any band or mode during FCC declared communication emergencies.

We have lost a few Minnesota Army Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS) operators due to their inability to upgrade beyond novice class. These were otherwise competent, reliable operators who were not technically inclined, or found the CW requirement difficult. Were they upgraded automatically, they would still be active. One individual who had to be eliminated from the MARS program because of his inability to upgrade was in remote upstate Minnesota where limited radio resources are located.

It seems that retaining and encouraging novice amateurs (through increased privileges) is an inexpensive method of increasing the number involved in emergency communications.

I do not support automatic upgrade of Advance class license holders. Doing so will not enhance support of emergency communications, nor enhance technical experimentation.

Steve Fraasch, K0SF

**Message 20 of 20**

From: <k5zol@earthlink.net>
To: ak437@acorn.net
Date: Thu, 02 Jan 2003 12:48:17 -0800
Subject: Re: UR FCC petition

I went to their website. Is making comments easier than it looks? Looked like I'd have to spend some time learning their system and getting things in the format they accept?

I would like to comment, but have never done that before.

K5ZOL

On Thu, 2 Jan 2003 15:39:17 US/Eastern ak437@acorn.net wrote:

> Thanks
>
> Please have your comments filed on line at the
> FCC ECFS page.
>
> Any additional input would be help!
>
> If you have any other changes you feel should
> be blended into
> this please make your point line by line so
> they have public
> input.
>
> Thanks Again
>
> Dale Reich - k8ad
>
> > I think your upgrade petition makes a lot of
> sense. goodluck.
> > 73,
> >
> > Bob K5ZOL
> >
>
>
>

> -----
> This message was sent using ACORN.net, a
> service of the
> Akron-Summit County Public Library.
> <http://www.acorn.net>
>
>
>





RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

Message 20 of 20

From: <k5zol@earthlink.net>
To: ak437@acorn.net
Date: Thu, 02 Jan 2003 12:48:17 -0800
Subject: Re: UR FCC petition

I went to their website. Is making comments easier than it looks? Looked like I'd have to spend some time learning their system and getting things in the format they accept?

I would like to comment, but have never done that before.

K5ZOL

On Thu, Jan 2 2003 15:39:17 US/Eastern ak437@acorn.net wrote:

> Thanks
>
> Please have your comments filed on line at the
> FCC ECFS page.
>
> Any additional input would be help!
>
> If you have any other changes you feel should
> be blended into
> this please make your point line by line so
> they have public
> input.
>
> Thanks Again
>
> Dale Reich - k8ad
>
> > I think your upgrade petition makes a lot of
> sense. goodluck.
> > 73,
> >
> > Bob K5ZOL
> >

> -----
> This message was sent using ACORN.net, a
> service of the
> Akron-Summit County Public Library.
> <http://www.acorn.net>

RECEIVED
DEC 30 2003**Message 11 of 20**

From: "Bob Maser" <bmaser@tampabay.rr.com>
To: <ak437@acorn.net>
Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 22:49:25 -0500
Subject: RM-10621

Dale, I disagree with your proposal RM-10621 just as much as I disagreed with the no code Extra. And I still think that it was a slap in the face for those of us that had to get to that 20 WPM level in order to be able to use DX frequencies. This latest proposal of yours makes no sense at all. The way I look at it, if you fail the driving test for 20 years you still shouldn't be given a license to drive until you learn well enough to pass the test. Anyone who has been an Advanced for 20 years either doesn't have the interest in putting in the effort or has probably been inactive for most of that time. We all seem to be so concerned that this great hobby of ours is getting obsolete that we are willing to drop the price of admission so that anyone can get on the air. If you would take the time to listen around the bands, you can hear testimony that the hobby is becoming almost as bad as CB.

Sincerely,
Bob Maser
W6TR

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopeedia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude



> ...
Dear FCC...

I wish to support automatically upgrading Advanced license holders to the "next" license class if the licensee has 20 or more years of operating experience. In my own case, I have been licensed since 1958- progressing from Novice to General to Advanced.

Most colleges will grant credits for "Life experience" in particular fields. As an example, in 1982 I was granted 34 credits towards an Associate degree in Electronics Technology because of work experience and attendance at the Signal School at Ft. Gordon, GA and the Signal School at Ft. Monmouth, NJ- even though the schools were attended over 20 years previously. While examinations do set a certain standard for qualification nothing beats experience. In addition, examinations conducted, in my case over 30 years ago, were much stricter and demanding.

In addition, with FCC changes, many licensees were "grandfathered" to a higher grade- with the exception of holders of the Advanced Class license.

The FCC has fully admitted the technical difference between the Advanced Class and the Extra class is "minimal". This fact along with a recognition of licensed "Life experience" as a holder of an Advanced license of 20 years should suffice. In fact, the FCC could grandfather all Advanced licensees under the former premise and eliminate this class of license and the burden of dealing with it. Why maintain a license grade that is no longer issued?

Sincerely,

James W Beckett

KD2KU

</bigger>



Message 12 of 20

From: wa4ixn@juno.com
To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 05:13:12 -0600
Subject: Upgrades

Received: from m5.nyc.untld.com (m5.nyc.untld.com [64.136.22.68])
by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with SMTP id gBVBAts04691
for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Tue, 31 Dec 2002 06:10:55 -0500 (EST)
Received: from cookie.juno.com by cookie.juno.com for <"uiPPpOjxs1EiqWFBG6HhPQ1OQRPhQIhjKyMIy44JCDUFnvRe
Received: (from wa4ixn@juno.com)
by m5.nyc.untld.com (jqueuemail) id HMCTMEAY; Tue, 31 Dec 2002 06:10:27 EST
To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us
Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 05:13:12 -0600
Subject: Upgrades
Message-ID: <20021231.051319.-836001.36.wa4ixn@juno.com>
X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.33
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 0-2,43,62,70,88,95,103-108
From: wa4ixn@juno.com
X-UIDL: &Gpd9+<0e9\$;@!!?+Ee9
Status: RO

Hi Dale,

Your proposal is good. Most hams don't realize that the exams have become easier through the years. The purpose being to swell the ranks with new hams without making it too difficult for them. In the "good-old-days" the exams were more technically oriented to the kind of equipment one would expect to be operating. A lot of which would be built from scratch or converted from military equipment. Rules and regulations weren't such a large portion of the exams. Neither was a lot of algebraic calculation that had little or no use in the 'real world' of ham radio. It seems now that the 'wizards' who sit and dream up the question pools are looking for electronic engineer types instead of ordinary people who just want to enjoy the hobby and talk to others of the same ilk down the street or around the world. I've been saying -- too loudly sometimes -- that if you want to play the moon bounce, ham TV, microwave, satellite games, etc., then fine. Study up on the required technology and go for it. But don't take chunks of the ordinary bands away from those of us who studied hard for the exams of 30, 40, 50 years ago, with the bent toward punched steel, hand wired, tube filled chassis, and earned the privilege and used the whole band to good purpose, just to glorify your urge to expand your knowledge. I don't know if you were around back in the 1960's when, with the full support of the ARRL, the 'blue-bloods' of ham radio crammed their desire for "incentive licensing" down the throat of the FCC and took big chunks of the bands away from the majority of hams who were, for the most part, much more active in actually using those frequencies than they were. It took a lot of hard-nosed politicking and a lot of money in the right places, but they got it done over the cries of despair from the 'average' hams and even from such notables as Barry Goldwater who was very active in the efforts to stop the breaking up of the bands. A good 'for instance' would be: You've been a licensed driver for 20 or 30 years and have exercised the privileges of your license by driving any road you want, from one end to the other, including the superhighways and interstates, in your good old Ford or Chevy. Suddenly, a bunch of wealthy executives of the black tie and tails group with their Mercedes and Jaguars decide to change things more in their favor. If you can't, or don't want to, come up to their standard, then they are going to pressure the highway department into kicking you off the roads you have driven ever since you got your license. From now on you can only drive on the back roads and be crowded into grid block traffic while the high-and-mighty who meet the new standard they set for themselves get the full use of all the roads, including the almost vacant portions they've set aside for their



exclusive use.

I studied hard. I build radios from scratch and scrap. I learned all I could about communications. I took and passed on the first go-around both the Novice and the General exams. Since then, over the past fifty (50) years, I've probably built more radio equipment from junk-box parts and from kits than any dozen of those so-called "super ham" Advanced and Extra class types. About the only things Heathkit made between 1955 (when I first could afford to buy them) and when they closed their doors in the mid '70s that I didn't build right out of the box was their television sets and stereo music boxes. The same for Knight kits and several Eico transceivers. Even now, at age 66, I still get the honor of handling the high-speed Morse on field day. Out of 69 club members there are only 3 of us who can handle more than 10 wpm. And I still use, almost exclusively, Morse in my daily operation. I don't use a keyer or a keyboard. I still use a 20-year-old Vibroplex (have worn out 3 of them), or when mobile an old WW-II leg-clamp J-38. I normally cruise along at 35-40 wpm, except with the J-38, and slow down only to work and help a Novice or Tech-plus learn code. I do have a microphone (D-104) on my desk, but it has a plastic cover on it and hasn't been used more than once in the last couple of years.

Yes, I am considering moving up to Extra Class, I've looked at the books and the question pool. To tell the truth, I have no use at all for satellites, TV, microwave, etc., and I find the high mathematics required just to regain the lost spectrum that I worked hard for 50 years ago, and feel I didn't deserve to have taken away from me, to be just so much useless garbage. I may be forced to learn all that algebraic gibberish to get my frequencies back, but I'll never use it and will toss the books in the trash the moment the exam is passed.

That brings me to the point of this letter. Why did you only specify advancing Novice and Advanced Class licensees?? There are thousands of General Class bums like me out here who are still burning at the stake over having our hard earned frequencies yanked away from us 35 years ago for the sake of a handful of nerds who only wanted the apportionment for their private use and who spend most of their time playing in the GHz bands anyway. We would love to be able to work the low ends and middle of the 80, 40, 20, and 15 meter bands again. To be able to spread out a bit so it would be so crowded all the time with everybody jammed in to small segments of the bands. Why not allow for General Class hams with 20 or more years of experience and clean records to get 'merit advancement' up to Extra Class too. I think that my 50 + years as a General (the highest class there was when I took the exam) and being highly active, especially in ARES, RACES, and Skywarn, with no violations or warnings and not even a OO note on my record, should count for something worthwhile rather than a 'look-down-the-nose from the hoity-toities of the modern super-hams, many of whom act as if they are the only ones deserving any operating privileges at all.

I think I'll get down off my soapbox now. This subject is one that I have been extremely angry and outspoken on for many years, and likely will continue to be so. I apologize if you feel I've overstepped the bounds of propriety here, but I'm not one to beat around the bush when it comes to something I think is important and will help improve the operating quality and morale of the majority of affected Amateur Radio operators.

Believe me. I have no quarrel with you as an Extra Class. I know you worked hard for it and deserve all the extra privileges it provides. I just think there are many of us out here who deserve more than the short shrift we got at the hands of a few holier-than-thou's who took command of the bands 35 years ago, with the able assistance of the ARRL pushing the buttons at the FCC. There's just not too many of us left now who have the strength left to fight anymore. When the last of us is SK it will all be over.

73 & Happy New Year
O. B. Wolf - WA4IXN
ex: 5A1TS, TA4RZ, DL4NH
WA4IXN/XV Air Mobile
WA4IXN/HZ Air Mobile





RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

Message 11 of 21

From: "Bob Maser" <bmaser@tampabay.rr.com>
To: <ak437@acorn.net>
Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 22:49:25 -0500
Subject: RM-10621

Dale, I disagree with your proposal RM-10621 just as much as I disagreed with the no code Extra. And I still think that it was a slap in the face for those of us that had to get to that 20 WPM level in order to be able to use DX frequencies. This latest proposal of yours makes no sense at all. The way I look at it, if you fail the driving test for 20 years you still shouldn't be given a license to drive until you learn well enough to pass the test. Anyone who has been an Advanced for 20 years either doesn't have the interest in putting in the effort or has probably been inactive for most of that time. We all seem to be so concerned that this great hobby of ours is getting obsolete that we are willing to drop the price of admission so that anyone can get on the air. If you would take the time to listen around the bands, you can hear testimony that the hobby is becoming almost as bad as CB.

Sincerely,
Bob Maser
W6TR

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopædia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude



1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

2430 255

$$e^{\frac{1}{2} \pi i} = \sqrt{-1}.$$

JOchmann@aol.com

ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us

Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:26 EST

General Class?

-2

&n



RECEIVED
DEC 30 2002
16:53:08

Message 8 of 39

From: "CWO3" <cwo3@elp.rr.com>
To: <ak437@acorn.net>
Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 16:53:08 -0700
Subject: RM10620

Received: from txsmtp03.texas.rr.com (smtp3.texas.rr.com [24.93.36.231])
by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with ESMTP id gBUNr9s18440
for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:53:10 -0500 (EST)
Received: from k6cwo (cpe-24-174-215-49.elp.rr.com [24.174.215.49])
by txsmtp03.texas.rr.com (8.12.5/8.12.2) with SMTP id gBUNnqUr015565
for <ak437@mail.acorn.net>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:49:54 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <00a901c2b05e\$9a914020\$1400a8c0@k6cwo>
From: "CWO3" <cwo3@elp.rr.com>
To: <ak437@acorn.net>
Subject: RM10620
Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 16:53:08 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106
X-UIDL: QHud99?f!!^nd!!c_]!!
Status: RO

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi Dale, I would prefer to address my comments about RM-10620 using a =
more direct avenue, at least get you comment first.



I think that your suggestion the establish a rule change that would =
advance by one level "Novice" and "Advance" ham radio license holders, =
that have held there license for more than twenty years, is admirable, =
and at first brush a really great suggestion that would encourage and =
recognize deserving individuals.

I haven't been a ham that long, first licensed in April 2000. My =
experience since then is that the longer many, not all, ham radio =
operators are licensed the less they honor the spirit of ham radio, and =
conduct themselves as "elitist". The biggest violation being the use of =
the phonetic alphabet. Even when requested many senior hams simply =
repeat what ever it is they have become accustom to, or make some =
unnecessary comment. The "elitist" attitude does not end there, but =
that is the most common infraction, or lack of courtesy even when asked =
for.

I agree that with time all active hams learn more about the hobby than =
can be found in any book, although I must admit that the available =
documentation on a whole range of ham related topics is excellent. As =
it relates to the "Novice" class license's...somewhere along the line =
they should have learn just enough to take the test for the next level. =
As it applies to the "Advance" class license's I can see that having to =
recall the amount of technical knowledge required to achieve "Extra" =
class may be a tall order, and if they are in good standing in the ham =
community, then I agree with your recommendation, with my above comment. =

I am confident that you, as are all active ham radio operators. are =
familiar with the points I have commented on. I would enjoy a dialogue =
with you, so as to listen to your perspective before making a public =
comment with the FCC.

Sincerely,
 Roland
 K6CWO

-----=_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140

Content-Type: text/html;
 charset="Windows-1252"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Dwindows-1252">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1126" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#d4d0c8>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins>Hi Dale,&nbsp; I would prefer to =
address&nbsp;my=20
comments about RM-10620 using a more direct avenue, at least get you =
comment=20
first.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins>&nbsp;</FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins>I think that your suggestion the establish a =
rule change=20
that would advance by one level "Novice" and "Advance" ham&nbsp;radio =
license=20
holders, that have held there license for more than twenty years, is =
admirable,=20
and at first&nbsp;brush a really great&nbsp;suggestion that would =
encourage and=20
recognize&nbsp;deserving individuals.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins>&nbsp;</FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins>I haven't been a ham that long, first licensed =
in April=20
2000.&nbsp; My experience since then is that the longer many, not =
all,&nbsp;ham=20
radio operators are licensed the less they honor the spirit of ham =
radio, and=20
conduct themselves as "elitist".&nbsp; The biggest violation being the =
use of=20
the phonetic alphabet.&nbsp; Even when requested many senior hams simply =
repeat=20
what ever it is they have become accustom to, or make some unnecessary=20
comment.&nbsp; The "elitist" attitude does not end there, but that is =
the most=20
common infraction, or lack of courtesy even when asked for.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins>I agree that with time all active hams learn =
more about=20
the hobby than can be found in any book, although I must admit that the=20
available documentation on a whole range of ham related topics is=20
excellent.&nbsp; As it relates to the "Novice" class =
license's...somewhere along=20
the line they should have learn just enough to take the test for the =
next=20
level.&nbsp; As it applies to the "Advance" class license's I can see =
that=20
having to recall the amount of technical knowledge required to achieve =
"Extra"=20
class may be a tall order, and if they are in good standing in the ham=20
community, then I agree with your recommendation, with my above=20
comment.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins>I am confident that you, as are all active ham =
radio=20
operators. are familiar with the points I have commented on.&nbsp; I =
would enjoy=20
a dialogue with you, so as to listen to your perspective before making a =
public=20
comment with the FCC.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins>Sincerely,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphins>Roland</FONT></DIV>
```


<DIV>K6CWO</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140--

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopædia Studios
Microcompanies With Attitude

